Dear Hoard, 7/11/72

Your mailing of the 10th came this a.m. Our mail is now later, now man. In it are a couple of clips I'll read later, you letter to me of the 10th., confidential memo of 7/5 conversation with Sylvia, Jerrys 7/6 and your 7/6 answer. I've heard nothing further from either. Thi is a large volume, I'd dropping everything to read it, and if any requires response unless I make it as I read, I may not be able to. So, there may be some confusion. I was up late, thru the points of order after the de;egate contest Calif., and got up at my usual hour, so I'm also tired. I had begun to read your 10, then realized the above, and in skimming what you enclosed I see you do make reference to Sylvia being hooked on amphetemines. So, you can see why I didn t send you her letter to me. I think she can be abused by misuse of this, and if Jerry doesn t know, don't tell him or anyone else. She told me and it both worried me and helped me understand. My strongest feeling about her is sorrow. It is not hate.

You do understand correctly. I did take that time in what I regard as your interest. Obviously, there is nothing else in it. But that is the way it should be, so feel no obligation. It is a responsibility and a liability of years. And affection.

You say you have had a decision to make. Thought you had at the beginning. But bear in mind that there si no vital difference either way except in your thinking of yourself.

"....considering Wecht's latest behavior not befitting anyone who calls himself a man." If you do not amplify this, when you have time, would appreciate separately. If you want confidential, write on it, as you have, and I do prefer red. Easier to spot fast.

In the rest of this graph, all is normal. You were merely, as you say, beginning to mature. My concern was not with your intellectual equipment but your lack of worldly experience. Witb ref to your unauthorized use of my material: thanks for the candor. I'd assumed it, despite my high regard for you and your integrity. That is the chief reason I didn t want to see your ms. I'd have had to tell you about it. It is better for you that you learned this way, on your own. Straighter trunk, tree! I am also aware that this is one of the hazards of helping. I'm having to change because of The Mess, but there will be only a few, and now I know I don t have to worry about you. I think you know I never really did. At your age it would have been too exceptional for you not to have been tempted as you were. I knew. I was once you age and have known many others. We are all basically alike. No ashes on the head.

Will copy and send SM's letter. You may copy, but please return for duplicate filing.

Please also don't worry about the effects of whatever SM does or doesn 't now do. I think it would not be uncharitable, despite the difference inyour ages, to have at least in the back of your mind some of the attitude you undertand I've had about you. She is not inherently as abd a person as she has been with almost everything haveing to do with me and almost from the first. We can't use Wecht as a second-line defense after Long John anyway. All that remains of possible constructive use of which I can now conceive is my original plan. He nevr responded and I think there is now less chance. I outlied it to you, I'm sure.

SM:One can't always separate the mental and the physical. I know too little, but I think the root with her is in the mind, not the body.

Either way on Mary is OK. My chief interest, as I now recall, was feedback from Mary who is a woman, exceedingly keen, and knows Sylvia well. They have spent more time together than I have with either. No sweat. And M is over her head now. I think it unlikely they will talk unless SM phones her.

Your point about my trust and including strangers in it is well take. You are not alone. Mary, Lil and even Gary agree. Yes, Gary! Two things: this is the way I am; and I may not see these people again and there is the question should I try to level as best I can. It has not often been in my mind, if ever, whether or not the result was in my interest.

I want you to reconsider you line about Wecht in the light of what you said earlier about your growth and changes that embarrass you as you mature and understand better: "...my speaking to him does <u>not</u> mean I approve of what he is doing." I require no persuasion to go further, and to believe that you may even have doubts about his inner motivation. That you do or do not speak to him doesn't really trouble me either way. Think of was it JFK's words:He who is silent, in the face of evil becomes part of it. I don't want you to think of it this way later. Don t let this influence you. Think and be aware. And we are not yet certain that evil is inveitable (I do now think it is in his intentions in the form of fuck-everythig-but-me self-seeking), we or I think that it is probable. For myself I also see no real probable benefit aside from personal considerations.

I think you should realize that the use of some of my work is inevitable and outside your control. Remember, I also trusted him and informed and loaned in confidence. Even spoke.

Moveover, you now know that some was stolen and when it was duplicated, it was duplicated from what also was stolen. Aside from this, I'm surprised you haven't reported what I have already detected, theft or misuse of more than you have told me. Let's see if you get it for yourself. I don't want to color anyway.

I'm having to rush so I may make mistakes other than in typing. But reread penult graph p. 2 nd ask if you aren't really saying that you have to see to it that the head of the Academy of Forensic Sciences, a great forensic pathologist, knows forensic path.

With Jerry it is as you say. He, too, has problems, of his generation and I suspect a broken marriage and ambivalent feelings about his real father, close enough to annoy and prick conscience. I erred in considering him only unhousebroken and a mental and emotional child. I wasted much time trying to lep him put his head together. Don't worry about the problems he can make for you. With whom? If he tries it with Sylvia, it may be a helpful catharsis for her. He won't reall hurt you unless you waste precious time with him. Without yet reading the exchange, as ageneral policy I agree, as my record shows, with leaving a record, as between people, on issues and for history. You know my own files are unpurged and now are unpurgable.

Perhaps you misunderstood my comment on your first to him. It was that your think was so close to identical with mine and independent. You hadn't gotten my letter when you wrote him and you were, I think, more severe than I. If it does not come up, you might want to tell him that what Gary used to duplicate my work I also gave Gary inconfidence. To date no response from him on that letter. I think he will. And not like Jerry.

Glad you plodded with Ecclesiastes. It is also the most beautiful writing in the King James, if sometimes obscure, as you learned. There is much in the Old Testament.

JP's 7/6 Opening I have no intention responding typical. And copout to himself, too.

If you write again, note that he falls short as saying that Lifton did cite the d.c. and nudge him a bit about his own word, "advertise", and see if he can begin to think.

On the relevance of the Finck stuff and the panel report in his Times stuff, undiluted garbage. It was ego-tripping. What he heere avpids in any statement that he knows enough to know what he is into or doing or the subject.

That jazz on Wecht "omes crawling to you" is miserable even for one in his state. Asking for help is this?

Sunconsciously, he forecasts a "disaster" from Wecht here, but says it would be from ignorance. They why did he apply? What could his motive been in JP's eyes?

None of Lattimer's error can be attributed to ignorance of the basic evidence.

He also misrepresents me on disaster and deliberately.

On the briefing, "Harold won't do it." Now I won't, But what I told Cyril is that I'd have to wait and examine the situation when the time came, not no.

Flfton graph on "I had hoped it would move you to head him off" is like locking the barn after the horse os gone. And with Lidton it is as with some horses, as you are too young (and a city boy) to know: they learn how to unlatch doors.

Before reading you 7/8 to him. I must confess I don t think I have ever seen anything quite as self-deceptive and deliberately and fully dishonest, contradictory as this may seem. I think he may well have told Lifton about this just to hurt me and in the hope that Lifton would use. But I have published it and believe I have the legal rights to it except in it official interpretation. Jerry now has to hurt me, to save himself in his own esteem.

I see you also go into Finck. I regret you didn't tell him here that I gave Wecht his testimony was his incompetency in examining the panel report required it-and that I sent to to him immediately from N.O.- and that I gave N.O. all tjeir medical stuff, knowing the consequences.

As I think back, his attitude began to change in the writing of the article on the Times and the change is reflected in it.

To the bottom of page 3 I think you cooled off to much. He deserved harsher words.

1st graph, page 4: I've gone into this with him in detail, where real danger lies. Id rather you carry it no further. I think his twisted mind has rejected it and we may have to cope with it, so don't brief anyone any further on this or offsetting may become even more impossible.

Nothing to add except this thought: From Johnson's description Lifton might not have ordered that stuff until prodded by JP. Note my own earlier letter or today and my own belated realization. I'll comment on SM's separately because you ask confidence and I can then files separately. Best,

After finishing the first two pages I jumped into the pool for a couple of lengths to cool of (physically-over 85) and had the first chance to think. I wrote as I read. Before getting to SH's, it now being lunchtime, I tell you that while I was ~~xxxx~~ charitably inclined to Jerry, considering that he is immature and has unrecognized or unacknowledged if recognized emotional problems. I have tried to address some of these with him. But he is now self-disclosed as vicious and dishonest in ways not completely explained by these allowances. I now believe he is really beneath contempt. He is, strangely for one professing his political views, littlebetter than a moral and ethical HHH. You will note that he has abandoned his lie about not having seen this stolen stuff here. And it is quite also that everyone has the right is government files. He has the right to those he finds and uses, not to those of which he knows nothing. Jerry also knows that this work is published, respite his lie about it to you. He has copies and has made copies for others of the first two parts and knows when the third was copyrighted and skimmed part of it here.

Lil hasn't finished the salad. For your understanding and future self-protection, are you coming to see the bankruptcy within what is called the critical community? And the causes of some of the galling and lies? Sylvia's, for example, with so magnificent a work that was dated when it appeared, not only by having been fairly thoroughly covered earlier by others but because our knowledge had swept past her. She has done nothing good since and it hurts her. Who, really, has done any work since the very first book appeared? Do you need more than a hand to count? And has one of these caused any real problem? Do they not still get along, if, as between Hoch and me, with harsh exchanges freely made and freely accepted? More and more I come to think this is really what drives too many. Jerry seeks only a little self-importance, something he is not satisfied to get where he has earned it, in his professional work, which he apparently dislikes.

If you do a memo on Cyril, I'd like a second copy to put in my file on him. Be certain to mark if you want confidential. Otherwise, those who ome here may read, like Mary. There will be fewer! Or Dick.

CONFIDENTIAL

Sylvia did not tell me that she has been on amphetamines for 20 years. I don't think she said she suffered withdrawal. Nor do I think this prescription was for physical reasons, not for that long. I'd be interested in knowing how the prescription coincides with the end of her marriage, whether for the reason she gave you or the one I seem to recall, not a dependable recollection, to be usre. The remarkable thing is the coincide, receipt of my first letter. No response to second. Don't expect any without change in her.

Graph 2: while it is unlike I would have consulted with Cyril, I did not close door entirely and he has yet to inquire about what I regard as hazard. This also indicates that Cyril has seen the stuff. Where Lifton got the money to fly to Pgh is an interesting question, as is the possibility that he remained. He didn't fly accross the country for nix. I hope you and she carried this further, esp. how she thinks she is going to help him in any way he can or will accept if he has seen the stuff. Or what good it has her to have doubts now when she could and should have explored earlier. I am not particularly happy to be in the -told-you-so position. I can read this sentences any other way that that Cyril has seen:" She also told me that Jerry had told her that Lifton told him he met with Cyril for an hour in Pgh before Wecht got access." Nor can I imagine what good an hour would have done anyone but Lifton, whose ambition has been equalled only by his sickness and lack of any scruple.

Gary did not tell me he had sent her a carbon. I don't care, but had I know it I'd also have sent her a copy. I have no objection to your volunteering to her that Jerry's source of duplicating my work was in confidence and from me more than two years ago. If you desire.

How can she rationally now admit that"of course the government must have some plans to do damage to the whole truth, but that ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ we had this opportunity now and we should make the most of it" and I dont mean the internal contradiction alone, how can we "make the most" of a design to hurt us when we have no power and they have all? I can't imagibe a more complete vindication of my position or a more thorough self-condemnation of her refusal to enaged in a dialoague about this. But what is lacking in even this irrationality is any description of "this opportunity" except the possibulity of disaster, or as you certainly know, how little probability there is of substantial advancing of what I've

gathered and put together. Does this possibly in your present understanding begin to give you an idea of what we could have done so long ago if all the others were unselfish, were willing to use some of what they can t take with them, what kind of work PM could be if instead of all the tinselly futilities on which she wasted time SM could have edited it, and if Cyril had not only gone over it and my other material with his expertise? Carry this a bit further and ask yourself if we did not have a real opportunity if to this you dd his acceptance of my offer of a safe way to btry to break it open, by fomral charges, and with this book available to back it all up -and in the right context? In considering this, you should also understand that there is no possibility of repayment if the book were to be what under the best circumstances it couldn't be, a best-seller. What we have in this is beyond compensation, beyond repayment in cash or recovery in any way. And in a great over-simplification, can you not now ask yourself where all the real selfishness really lies?

Why does shoe NOW find "perfectly reasonable" you position that my "material not be mentioned"? I preumse you meant used. Gow is it now reasonable and unreasonable all the time up to now?

"she has always tried to stop Cyril from making such statements"! MY God, Howard, that Nebel stuff was not NEW to her?I think you should do some really deep thinking on what this says of her, her judgement, and probably unrecognized intents, for which I suggest you have ample context for what can t long be ignored as a possibility of not a probability. How much worse this is if she had to call in on the show and correct him, and has so firmly held to what now can't be better than an absolutely insane position if after each of the apparently unstopable irrationalities and irresponsibilities "she writes him detailed letters afterwards pointing out his mistakes". And she would enter into no dialogue with me when I visioned disaster and she knew this and I didn't? I don't spy on these people, so I had no such knowledge. What is in the Epilogue you read didn't became as clear until I reread the file for the writing. Can you try and give me a disappassionate explanation of all of this that in your opinion, not mine, can be considered anything from reasonable or rational to responsible or irresponsible, to anything but ulterior motive on her part?

You talk about trying to "save him". If what can be used against him, which must be much worse than I know, is used, prithee tell me who can try and "save" and how and who can think of the effort without recognizing the seeds of his own destruction and that of any shred of integrity? I think you now have to answer this to yourself, quitebseparately, for if he has seen the stuff, you can't now "brief" him. And this, too, is what you'll have to live with if not, indeed, sruvive.

Here you refer to the future, "details to look for", seemingly inconsistent with the Lifton/Pgh hour's meeting "before Wecht got access".

On response to her changed position after reading my second letter, aside from its lack of genuineness, she is factually quite incorrect. I can show you a rather large effort besides what youdknow of ot arrange usedof this material, including her (she could see no more than a mag piece in The New York Review, in the Garrison case, by Cyril in court-all with at best a corrupt and inadequate press; with showing to a TV net and two large newspaper syndicates; efforts at LOOK; LIFE, a number of publishers. Not just talk, a realk effort. And there remains what she must at some time confront, the refusal of those with the means to make it possible for the whole thing to appear. Do not mention her or Cyril, but include Ned and ask about that whole shabby thing about which she kept her mouth closed on all details, and Arch Timbrough and Bud Fensterwald as only a beginning. I think it is time to start blowing on the coals of personal guilt, pennypinching self- serving and self-deception. It may be the only inner purge possible. When to her knowledge I have two of the three parts away, one to Cyril, who used what he could comprehend in court, and the other to Garrison, love coming from the mouth of a worn-out whore is more genuine than any allegationthat I have been "suppressing this info from the public" (your paph.

On confidentiality this is as big a lie as she can utter. There is, first of all, nothing not traditional in my position, and the total refuation is above. Her record on Epstein and Forman is more than enough, and it is but a beginning. Because she was uncritical both hurt us. But she DID keep both entirely confidential. What a comparison when she makes such a complaint. I think you should know that from the first, except for the contents of WW, she refused to accept anything from me in confidence that I can remember, including what her own interest required. She preferred egregious error that would gnaw at a decent, rational mind. In no sense is there any difference between her getting the death certificate from

me directly or from me with an intermediary, knowing it is from me. I hope you warned her about context and full comprehension, not yet indicated. It is past time to tell her how far out of it she is, most of all by refusing to think, not by refusing to work. She is better equipped than any of the others to do this thinking.

Before she is moved, yyour word, to have Wecht hold a press conference and release it, aside from the pre-existence of a copyright that is valid and precludes use without my permission when everyone involved knows of it, I now have a chain of possession proving a deliberate reconstruction of my work from my materials given and accepted in confidence. It as I doubt there was anything genuine in her claim that she would have been "torn", a claim amply rebutted by confidences from Thornley, Lifton, Epstein, Tink, Forman and it seems Wecht to begin with, she had better realize how "torn" she will be if and when I can get to doing something about this. One of the more promising opportunities will be if there is the potential disaster.

Next graph unowrthy of combat. But when she gets her fat ass of a soft chair and does a little ballting of her own, with or without sleep, any criticism will come with better grace. Again I point to the record, Liebeler's sunsequent total silence and withdrawal of his UC project and his book. As far as mopping up the floor is concerned, that cheapens her a bit too much.

She is a deliberate liar when she says what is in any event irrelevant, that she had a bound copy of Epstein before she saw WW. Read my files. She had WW before Epstein finished and returned it before she ever heard of him. Ask youself why she should lie now. Although WW had then been done for about a year, she then evaluated it as infinitely better than her own, so I presume she spent the next year improving her own with what she learned for it. There was little to learn from Ep or Lane. I have no objections. I offered her everything I had. My sole objection is to the initial dishonesty and its reproduction after she was caught in it in time to change it, and there chieflt as a subconscious reflection of what galls her and make her hate, calling it love. And respect.

It is a deliberate lie to say she "forgot" to correct this error. It is this about which she got furious about our UH lunch meeting. She then said that so far as she was concerned the limited edition had no standing (it was 1965 and the one she read) and I then reminded her that the general edition was two months ahead of his still. This is deliberte effortx to con you and presevre some internal self-respect. There is no possibility of accident here, none of "forgetting". I emphasize this because of what it means, not what ir cost me, which is nothing except in her mind. Can you understand what it then told me about her?

Howard, reread the g aph in which tou quote her in some shock as saying "Then Specter knows the whole socre!" Forget about my telling her this (and I think she or Vince or both leaked it to Tink is late 1966 or early 1967 and that she read it EMI. Forget all that should suggest itself to you along these line, and ask yourself several things: first whether she does not lust to pin the whole thing on the Kennedys, any and all, and the hell with exculation of the guilty; ask first how she can say "this does not change things" and have any sincerity in it. "Somehow the ~~Kennedyx Kennedyx~~ public should be informed that the Kennedys did not suppress this material." Like Teddy stopped beating his wife? She and Ned have been in on just the opposite, together, for a long time. It doesn t, by the wat, "tear" her to keep Ned's work against me/us in confidence, does it, as long as iit is get-Kennedy work, or get-Harold. Can you believe this shit? And if you do, can you believe or trust any of that cabal. What is next is ever worse: "She said that she genuinely was not aware before tonight that this material was really in the hands of the Commission." First, obviously, if for no other reason, because she refused to discuss it with me in any way. Second, lie. I told her about the exsess part long ago, in the Specter context.

That her thinking has not changed with 20 cents will get you a cheap hamburger. It is too late, except for making it worse and inhibiting any possible counterattack or rectification, and she bears heavy personal responsibility on that, not beginning with but including Ned and Cyril and Jerry and Gary and Lifton and many, many others.

What does reform of the coroner system have to do with Cyril's activities here or with the nonexistent risk her runs. Can she be so insensitive to the not potential but reals ones of ours of which she has known enough for seven yeard and only adds to?

How noble it is for everyone to "work together in the interest of the case" to help the interloper/faker/self-seeker Cyril, but how ignoble it would have been for this to have

been done with us when we were the only ones really working full-time on this, really going after and getting new things, really offering them to everyone who would look. Somehow there is mischief in helping work, but decency in helping what she now admits has to be part of government dirty-wrok. I fear I suffer the liabulity of having been formed in my ethics and thinking before the says of what I think you will remember, "The New Math and The New Morality".

If there wa this genuine interest in doing something, why did 100% of those in a position to a?quit work entirely and b) not help ongoing work in any way and c) do what they could to destroy it and its effectiveness?

From this memo of this conversation you have much more thinking to do. Please also clarify me on whether or not Cyril has actually seen this stuff.

You are wise and mature to ask the questions with which you conclude. They are not now for you the impirtant ones. I don't care what her motives, for enough are clear. I don't care what she says she thinks of me or Cyril, for her actions leave nothing but their meaning and words have no way of offsetting or changing. You now know more and worse. I rppeats, it is a matter of indofference personally to me, you do or you don't. It is not a matter of indifference to you. Think of yourself only, of whether anything is now possible and honorable, for anyone. At this point, egotistical as it may seem, I have no doubt about your intentions, but on the record, mine seem s to be the only honorable record. This does not mean you have been dishonorable. You haven t done anything. I mean compared with those who have. Tick them off and ask yourself, on any and all points. n retrospect I feel much better than at the outset I thought I would or could. Not at being hurt, abused, insulted behind my back, or having my wife live as she has. But about having seen clearly and adhered to a correct and principled position. We can t always look back with as few regrets, and this was one of the tougher decisions, one of the harder things to see clearly, tounderstand. You know I was all alone. Matter of fact, this is also very bad for me in another way. If inthe future there is disagreement, honest disagreement, between those few with whom I will have any intervourse and me, this experience more than perhaps any of the earlier ones like it may too easily concvince me to trust my own judgement and not that of others who may well in specific cases be correct and I wrong.

I have already copied and enclosed her letter of 7/4 to me. I can't make a better copy without the waste of paper I can't afford. If you later want a better one, when I am using the machine and you are here, you can make one if you can t from this. I am going to have to ask- and I do no more than ask - that you be responsible with this. You are not to use it in any way to hurt her. I have no interest in any defense of me. It is irrevelant to the problem and the situation. I do not have the reluctance I had earlier because she has told you about the pep pills. But I have no reluctance in repeating to you, keep your mouth shut about this unless you absolutely have no other choice. It can be misused to destroy her, and despite what she has done to me I neither want it nor want anyone else to do anything that might contribute to it. I don't think you do, but in time you may get bitter about this, so if you make a copy, attach some cauthion to it. This is impirtant to you, Mr. 19, as itx it to her. This is not a new thought with me. You now know better and more about Ned and Cyril. You also know how I handle them in the Epilogue, making it impossible for any but a very few of us to even know about whom I'm talking. My interest was not vengeance but an honest, accurate and complete historical record. Events may compel me to change this and add identifications, but as of now I have no such intention. If I do, I'll have to do more than identify. We never help ourselves or princple by hurting others. Sometimes hurt to others is unavoidable, which is different. But to do it deliberately is wrong and hurts those who do it, too.

I have not reread SH's 7/4 and don't intend to unless you have questions. I've spent more time on this than it would have taken to complete what I should do on PM and I've not been able to get to it. And I am into other things about which I've not carboned you because you have not been into them, and they take much time and thought. I may write EK another letter. If I do, I'll carbon, and it will not breach confidence, unless you would regard reference to Lifton except not mentioning his name a breachof confidence. It may be necessary. I don't want to. Remember, we are also in a political time, too.

If you go to the library and have some time, there are these things you can do for me. E Howard Hunt is in Who's Who for at least 1965. Lesar told me there are contradictory bios. He promised copies but hasn't delivered. They should be in hand. He is more impirtant than

has been indicated or disclosed. His listing for the year 1965 is supposed to include employment at Littaur and Wilkinson, 500 Fifth Ave, NYC. That is at 42nd., nw corner. I know. If you can see the NYC directory for that year and 1966, please get all the names listed for that office and if you can go further, see when that office changed names and if it continued in the same business and with any of the same people. Also, it would be good to know who then was in that office, what business, what personnel, etc. If I haven't filled you in on this, it will have to wait until you are here. Also a list of his works, if no great sweat, and when published and by whom. I don't have time to go to the Library congress on this and others will only talk about doing it. One of the more interesting possibilities is the book about the assassination of a President Castro of Panama. He also used pen names I can supply. If I get to responding to some accumulated mail before I send this, I'll enclose names, titles I have.

If you continue to be troubled, you can now recall without reading how Ecclesiastes beging, with vanity, the sun rising and setting with the earth abiding forever, and all the rivers running into the sea yet not filling it. The ~~oxxy~~ old boys said it like it is.

Best,

Ben